PROVERBS 29:20 — THE SIN OF HASTY AND UNVERIFIED SPEECH

SPREUKEN 29:20 — DE ZONDE VAN OVERHAAST EN ONGEVERIFIEERD SPREKEN

SPRÜCHE 29:20 — DIE SÜNDE DER VOREILIGEN UND UNGEPRÜFTEN REDE

箴言 29:20 — 輕率且未經查證之言語的罪

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

PART I: THE MISUNDERSTANDING — THIS VERSE IS NOT ABOUT ANGER

DEEL I: HET MISVERSTAND — DIT VERS GAAT NIET OVER WOEDE

TEIL I: DAS MISSVERSTÄNDNIS — DIESER VERS HANDELT NICHT VON ZORN

第一部分：被誤解的經文 — 此節經文與憤怒無關

[English]

Among certain Christian circles, Proverbs 29:20 has been erroneously conflated with a blanket prohibition against anger. Some preachers and teachers, reading the verse superficially, have twisted it into a proof-text that says, in effect, "getting angry is sinful" or "if you speak with passion or indignation, you are worse than a fool." This is a grave misreading. The verse says nothing about anger per se; it speaks about the person who is *hasty in his words* — that is, one who speaks without thinking, without verifying, without the disciplined restraint of truth. To collapse this into a mere anti-anger sentiment is to strip the text of its actual moral and theological force.

The reason this misunderstanding is so dangerous is that it leads Christians to believe that all expressions of anger are ungodly — and this is flatly contradicted by Scripture itself. If anger were inherently sinful, then both our Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostle Paul would stand condemned by their own faith.

Consider **Mark 3:5**: *"And He looked around at them with anger, being grieved at their hardness of heart, and said to the man, 'Stretch out your hand.'"* Here, the Gospel writer explicitly states that Jesus experienced anger — the Greek word used is **μετ' ὀργῆς** (met' orgēs) — a genuine, deep indignation directed at the Pharisees' callous refusal to value human life over their legalistic traditions. This was not a loss of self-control; this was righteous anger born of holy love. Jesus was angry because the Pharisees, in their self-righteous rigidity, would rather let a man suffer with a withered hand than see him healed on the Sabbath. In **John 2:13–17**, Jesus fashioned a whip of cords and drove the money-changers out of the Temple, overturning their tables and pouring out their coins, declaring, *"Take these things away; do not make my Father's house a house of trade!"* This was not an irrational outburst — it was a deliberate, prophetic act of righteous fury against the desecration of sacred space.

The Apostle Paul likewise commanded righteous anger. In **Ephesians 4:26**, he writes: *"Be angry and do not sin; do not let the sun go down on your anger."* This verse, quoting Psalm 4:4, is not a grudging concession that anger sometimes happens. It is an imperative: **"Be angry!"** (ὀργίζεσθε, orgizesthe). Paul commands Christians to experience anger — the righteous kind — when confronted with injustice, falsehood, and evil. The qualifier is not "do not be angry" but "do not sin" in your anger. In other words, anger itself is morally neutral and, in certain contexts, morally required; what makes it sinful is when it is uncontrolled, selfish, vindictive, or disproportionate.

As **Gary Hamrick** of Cornerstone Chapel has taught in his extensive surveys of Proverbs, the biblical standard for speech is not silence or passionless neutrality, but rather that our words be governed by *content, tone, purpose, and timing*. Righteous anger has its proper content (truth), its proper tone (measured but firm), its proper purpose (the defense of justice and the glory of God), and its proper timing (when evil must be confronted). **John F. MacArthur** has similarly emphasized that the tongue is the most dangerous instrument of sin, not because speaking itself is sinful, but because *careless and untruthful* speech defiles a person from within — an echo of Christ's own teaching in Matthew 15:11. **Voddie Baucham** has repeatedly warned that "sincerity can never substitute for truth" — a man may speak with great conviction and great passion, but if the content of his speech is false or unverified, his sincerity only compounds the offense.

Therefore, let us be clear from the outset: Proverbs 29:20 is emphatically *not* a prohibition against anger. To read it as such is to distort the Word of God and to disarm Christians of their duty to feel and express righteous indignation when the occasion demands it.

[Nederlands]

Binnen bepaalde christelijke kringen is Spreuken 29:20 ten onrechte samengevoegd met een algeheel verbod op woede. Sommige predikers en leraren, die het vers oppervlakkig lezen, hebben het verdraaid tot een bewijstekst die in feite zegt: "boos worden is zondig" of "als je met passie of verontwaardiging spreekt, ben je erger dan een dwaas." Dit is een ernstige misinterpretatie. Het vers zegt niets over woede op zich; het spreekt over de persoon die *haastig is in zijn woorden* — dat wil zeggen, iemand die spreekt zonder na te denken, zonder te verifiëren, zonder de gedisciplineerde terughoudendheid van de waarheid. Dit reduceren tot een louter anti-woede-sentiment is de tekst ontdoen van zijn werkelijke morele en theologische kracht.

De reden waarom dit misverstand zo gevaarlijk is, is dat het christenen ertoe brengt te geloven dat alle uitingen van woede goddeloos zijn — en dit wordt ronduit tegengesproken door de Schrift zelf. Als woede inherent zondig was, dan zouden zowel onze Heer Jezus Christus als de apostel Paulus veroordeeld worden door hun eigen geloof.

Overweeg **Markus 3:5**: *"En Hij keek hen rond met toorn, bedroefd over de verharding van hun hart, en zei tot de man: 'Strek uw hand uit.'"* Hier stelt de evangelieschrijver uitdrukkelijk dat Jezus woede ervoer — het Griekse woord dat wordt gebruikt is **μετ' ὀργῆς** (met' orgēs) — een oprechte, diepe verontwaardiging gericht op de harteloze weigering van de Farizeeën om menselijk leven boven hun legalistische tradities te stellen. Dit was geen verlies van zelfbeheersing; dit was rechtvaardige woede geboren uit heilige liefde. In **Johannes 2:13-17** maakte Jezus een zweep van koorden en dreef de geldwisselaars uit de tempel, keerde hun tafels om en gooide hun munten uit, en verklaarde: *"Neem deze dingen weg; maak het huis van mijn Vader niet tot een huis van handel!"*

De apostel Paulus gebood eveneens rechtvaardige woede. In **Efeziërs 4:26** schrijft hij: *"Wordt toornig en zondigt niet; laat de zon niet ondergaan over uw toorn."* Dit vers, een

aanhaling van Psalm 4:4, is geen onwillige concessie dat woede soms voorkomt. Het is een gebiedende wijs: **"Wordt toornig!"** (ὀργίζεσθε, orgizesthe). Paulus gebiedt christenen woede te ervaren — de rechtvaardige soort — wanneer zij geconfronteerd worden met onrecht, leugen en kwaad.

Zoals **Gary Hamrick** van Cornerstone Chapel heeft onderwezen in zijn uitgebreide studies van Spreuken, is de bijbelse norm voor spreken niet stilte of passieloze neutraliteit, maar eerder dat onze woorden worden bestuurd door *inhoud, toon, doel en timing*. **John F. MacArthur** heeft eveneens benadrukt dat de tong het gevaarlijkste instrument van zonde is, niet omdat spreken op zichzelf zondig is, maar omdat *onzorgvuldig en onwaar* spreken een persoon van binnenuit verontreinigt. **Voddie Baucham** heeft herhaaldelijk gewaarschuwd dat "oprechtheid nooit de plaats van waarheid kan innemen."

Laten we daarom vanaf het begin duidelijk zijn: Spreuken 29:20 is nadrukkelijk *geen* verbod op woede.

[Deutsch]

In bestimmten christlichen Kreisen wurde Sprüche 29:20 irrtümlicherweise mit einem pauschalen Verbot von Zorn gleichgesetzt. Einige Prediger und Lehrer, die den Vers oberflächlich lesen, haben ihn zu einem Beweistext verdreht, der im Grunde sagt: "Zornig werden ist sündhaft" oder "wenn du mit Leidenschaft oder Empörung sprichst, bist du schlimmer als ein Narr." Dies ist eine schwerwiegende Fehlinterpretation. Der Vers sagt nichts über Zorn an sich; er spricht über die Person, die *voreilig in ihren Worten* ist — das heißt, jemand, der spricht, ohne nachzudenken, ohne zu überprüfen, ohne die disziplinierte Zurückhaltung der Wahrheit. Dies auf ein bloßes Anti-Zorn-Sentiment zu reduzieren, bedeutet, dem Text seine tatsächliche moralische und theologische Kraft zu nehmen.

Der Grund, warum dieses Missverständnis so gefährlich ist, liegt darin, dass es Christen dazu verleitet zu glauben, alle Ausdrucksformen von Zorn seien gottlos — und dies wird von der Schrift selbst klar widerlegt. Wenn Zorn von Natur aus sündhaft wäre, dann stünden sowohl unser Herr Jesus Christus als auch der Apostel Paulus durch ihren eigenen Glauben verurteilt da.

Betrachten wir **Markus 3:5**: *"Und er sah sie ringsum an mit Zorn, betrübt über die Verhärtung ihres Herzens, und sprach zu dem Mann: 'Strecke deine Hand aus!'"* Hier stellt der Evangelist ausdrücklich fest, dass Jesus Zorn empfand — das verwendete griechische Wort ist **μετ' ὀργῆς** (met' orgēs). In **Johannes 2:13-17** fertigte Jesus eine Geißel aus Stricken und trieb die Geldwechsler aus dem Tempel.

Der Apostel Paulus gebot ebenfalls gerechten Zorn. In **Epheser 4:26** schreibt er: *"Zürnt ihr, so sündigt nicht; lasst die Sonne nicht über eurem Zorn untergehen."* Dies ist ein Imperativ: **"Zürnt!"** (ὀργίζεσθε, orgizesthe). Paulus gebietet Christen, Zorn zu empfinden — die gerechte Art — wenn sie mit Ungerechtigkeit, Lüge und Bösem konfrontiert werden.

Wie **Gary Hamrick** von der Cornerstone Chapel in seinen umfassenden Studien der Sprüche gelehrt hat, ist der biblische Maßstab für das Reden nicht Schweigen oder leidenschaftslose Neutralität, sondern vielmehr, dass unsere Worte von *Inhalt, Tonfall, Zweck und Zeitpunkt* bestimmt werden. **John F. MacArthur** hat ebenfalls betont, dass die Zunge das gefährlichste Instrument der Sünde ist, nicht weil Sprechen an sich sündhaft ist, sondern weil *nachlässiges und unwahres* Sprechen einen Menschen von innen heraus verunreinigt. **Voddie Baucham** hat wiederholt gewarnt, dass "Aufrichtigkeit niemals die Wahrheit ersetzen kann."

Lassen Sie uns daher von Anfang an klarstellen: Sprüche 29:20 ist ausdrücklich *kein* Verbot des Zorns.

[中文]

在某些基督教圈子中，箴言 29:20 被錯誤地與全面禁止憤怒混為一談。一些傳道人和教師膚淺地閱讀這節經文，將其扭曲為一段證明經文，實際上意思是：「生氣是有罪的」或「如果你帶著激情或義憤說話，你比愚昧人更糟。」這是一個嚴重的誤讀。這節經文對憤怒本身隻字未提；它所說的是一個在言語上急躁的人——也就是說，一個說話不經思考、不加查證、沒有真理之自律約束的人。將這節經文簡化為單純的反憤怒情緒，是剝奪了經文實際的道德和神學力量。

這種誤解之所以如此危險，是因為它使基督徒相信所有憤怒的表達都是不敬虔的——而這被《聖經》本身明確地反駁了。如果憤怒本質上是有罪的，那麼我們的主耶穌基督和使徒保羅都將被他們自己的信仰所定罪。

請看馬可福音 **3:5**：「耶穌怒目環視他們，為他們心裡剛硬而憂傷，就對那人說：『伸出手來！』」在這裡，福音書作者明確指出耶穌經歷了憤怒——所使用的希臘文是 **μετ' ὀργῆς**（met' orgēs）——一種真正的、深切的義憤，針對法利賽人冷酷地拒絕將人的生命看得比他們律法主義的傳統更重要。這不是失控；這是源於聖潔之愛的義怒。在約翰福音 **2:13-17**中，耶穌用繩子做成鞭子，把兌換銀錢的人從聖殿裡趕出去，推翻他們的桌子，倒出他們的錢幣，宣告說：「把這些東西拿走！不要把我父的殿當作買賣的地方！」

使徒保羅同樣命令義怒。在以弗所書 **4:26**中，他寫道：「生氣卻不要犯罪；不可含怒到日落。」這節經文引用了詩篇 4:4，不是勉強承認憤怒有時會發生。這是一個命令式：「你們要生氣！」（ὀργίζεσθε, orgizesthe）。保羅命令基督徒在面對不公義、虛假和邪惡時要經歷憤怒——義怒的那種。限定條件不是「不要生氣」，而是在你的憤怒中「不要犯罪」。

正如 Gary Hamrick（加里·海姆立克）在他對箴言的廣泛研究中所教導的，聖經對言語的標準不是沉默或無激情的中立，而是我們的話語應當受到內容、語氣、目的和時機的管理。約翰·麥克阿瑟同樣強調，舌頭是犯罪最危險的工具，不是因為說話本身有罪，而是因為草率和不真實的言語從內部玷污一個人。Voddie Baucham（沃迪·博尚）反覆警告說：「真誠永遠

不能替代真理。」唐崇榮牧師在他的改革宗傳道事工中同樣一再呼籲，傳道人和基督徒必須在真理的根基上說話，任何脫離真理的言語，無論動機如何，都是對上帝的虧欠。

因此，讓我們從一開始就明確：箴言 29:20 斷然不是禁止憤怒。將其如此理解就是扭曲神的話語，並且解除基督徒在場合需要時感受和表達義憤的責任。

PART II: THE ORIGINAL TEXTS — HEBREW, GREEK (SEPTUAGINT), COPTIC, AND GE'EZ

DEEL II: DE OORSPRONKELIJKE TEKSTEN — HEBREEUWS, GRIEKS (SEPTUAGINTA), KOPTISCH EN GE'EZ

TEIL II: DIE ORIGINALTEXTE — HEBRÄISCH, GRIECHISCH (SEPTUAGINTA), KOPTISCH UND GE'EZ

第二部分：原始文本 — 希伯來文、希臘文（七十士譯本）、科普特文和吉茲文

A. Hebrew (Masoretic Text / 希伯來文 / Hebreeuws / Hebräisch)

חָזִיתָ אִישׁ אָץ בִּדְבָרָיו תִּקְוָה לִכְסִיל מִמֶּנּוּ׃

Transliteration: *Ḥāzîṯā ʾîš ʾāṣ biḏbārāyw; tiqwāh liḵsîl mimmenū.*

Translation:

- **(EN):** "Do you see a man who is hasty in his words? There is more hope for a fool than for him."
- **(NL):** "Ziet gij een man die haastig is in zijn woorden? Er is meer hoop voor een dwaas dan voor hem."

- **(DE):** "Siehst du einen Mann, der voreilig ist in seinen Worten? Für einen Narren gibt es mehr Hoffnung als für ihn."
- **(ZH):**「你見過言語急躁的人嗎？愚昧人比他還有指望。」

B. Greek — Septuagint (LXX / 七十士譯本 / Septuaginta)
ἐὰν ἴδῃς ἄνδρα ταχὺν ἐν λόγοις, γίνωσκε ὅτι ἐλπίδα ἔχει μᾶλλον ὁ ἄφρων αὐτοῦ.

Transliteration: *Ean idēs andra tachyn en logois, ginōske hoti elpida echei mallon ho aphrōn autou.*

Translation:

- **(EN):** "If you see a man swift in words, know that the fool has more hope than he."
- **(NL):** "Indien gij een man ziet die snel is in woorden, weet dat de dwaas meer hoop heeft dan hij."
- **(DE):** "Wenn du einen Mann siehst, der schnell ist in Worten, wisse, dass der Tor mehr Hoffnung hat als er."
- **(ZH):**「若你看見一個言語迅速的人，要知道愚昧人比他更有指望。」

Note / Opmerking / Anmerkung / 注：The Septuagint uses **ταχὺν ἐν λόγοις** (tachyn en logois — "swift in words"), which corresponds precisely to the Hebrew **אָץ בִּדְבָרָיו** (ʾāṣ biḏḇārāyw — "hasty in his words"). The Greek further uses the verb **γίνωσκε** (ginōske — "know, recognize"), turning the verse from a question into a direct didactic imperative: "know this!" It also employs **ἄφρων** (aphrōn — "senseless, foolish"), the standard Septuagintal rendering of the Hebrew **כְּסִיל** (kᵊsîl — "fool, dullard"). The LXX rendering thus intensifies the warning: the one hasty in speech is not merely compared to a fool — the fool is declared to have *more* hope (ἐλπίδα… μᾶλλον).

C. Coptic — Sahidic Tradition (科普特文 — 撒希迪克傳統 / Koptisch — Sahidische Traditie / Koptisch — Sahidische Tradition)

The Sahidic Coptic Old Testament, translated from the Septuagint in the early centuries of the Egyptian Church, renders Proverbs 29:20 closely following the Greek text. From the Coptic Scriptorium (Sahidica), the verse reads:

ⲉⲕⲱⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϭⲉⲡⲏ ϩⲛ ⲛⲉϥⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲉ ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ

Transliteration: *Ekshannau eurome efjepe hn nefshaje, eie pathet ountaf nouhelpis ehoue erof.*

Translation:

- **(EN):** "If you see a man who is hasty in his speech, then the fool has more hope than he."
- **(NL):** "Indien gij een man ziet die haastig is in zijn spreken, dan heeft de dwaas meer hoop dan hij."
- **(DE):** "Wenn du einen Mann siehst, der hastig ist in seiner Rede, dann hat der Tor mehr Hoffnung als er."
- **(ZH):**「若你看見一個在言語上急躁的人，那麼愚昧人比他更有指望。」

Note: The Coptic tradition, rooted in the earliest Egyptian Christian communities and among the oldest textual witnesses to the Old Testament, confirms the universal patristic understanding: the verse concerns *haste of speech*, not emotional anger. The Coptic ⲉϥϭⲉⲡⲏ (efjepe — "being hasty/swift") mirrors the Greek **ταχύν** and the Hebrew **יָחִישׁ**. The word for "fool," ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ (pathet), derives from the Greek **ἄφρων** (aphrōn) via Coptic adaptation, preserving the meaning of "one without sense."

D. Ge'ez — Ethiopian Tradition (吉茲文 — 衣索比亞傳統 / Ge'ez — Ethiopische Traditie / Ge'ez — Äthiopische Tradition)

The Ethiopian Bible, one of the oldest complete biblical canons in the world, preserves Proverbs in the ancient Ge'ez language. Based on the Dillmann Ethiopic text (digitized by Ran HaCohen), Proverbs 29:20 reads:

ለእመ ፡ ርኢከ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ዘይቄልጥ ፡ በቃሉ ፡ ዕወቅ ፡ ከመ ፡ ለዐሻ ፡ ተስፋ ፡ ይበልጦ።

Transliteration: *Laʾəmma rəʾika bəʾəsi zayəqēləṭ baqālu, ʿəwaqa kama laʿaššā tasfā yəballəṭo.*

Translation:

- **(EN):** "If you see a man who is hasty in his speech, know that a fool has more hope than he."
- **(NL):** "Indien gij een man ziet die haastig is in zijn spreken, weet dat een dwaas meer hoop heeft dan hij."
- **(DE):** "Wenn du einen Mann siehst, der hastig ist in seiner Rede, wisse, dass ein Narr mehr Hoffnung hat als er."
- **(ZH):**「若你看見一個在言語上急躁的人，要知道愚昧人比他更有指望。」

Note: The Ge'ez tradition follows the Septuagint closely in structure, using the conditional construction ለእመ (laʾəmma — "if") and the imperative ዕወቅ (ʿəwaqa — "know!"), identical to the Greek **γίνωσκε**. The word ዘይቄልጥ (zayəqēləṭ) conveys "one who rushes/hastens," and በቃሉ (baqālu) means "in his word/speech," corresponding to the Hebrew **בִּדְבָרָיו**. The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church has thus preserved this verse's essential meaning through its ancient Semitic sister-language, offering an independent confirmation that the text is about *hasty speech*, not *emotional anger*.

PART III: THEOLOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC EXEGESIS

DEEL III: THEOLOGISCHE EN TAALKUNDIGE EXEGESE

TEIL III: THEOLOGISCHE UND LINGUISTISCHE EXEGESE

第三部分：神學和語言學釋經

[English]

The Hebrew verb **אָץ** (ʾāṣ), from the root א-ו-ץ (ʾ-w-ṣ), means fundamentally "to press, to urge, to hasten, to rush." It carries the connotation of impulsive urgency, of acting under pressure — not the pressure of external circumstances, but the internal compulsion to speak before one has thought. The root appears in other Old Testament contexts where haste is linked to recklessness and error (cf. Proverbs 21:5, where "the plans of the diligent lead to abundance, but everyone who is hasty comes only to poverty"). The participial form **אָץ** describes a habitual condition: this is not about a single slip of the tongue, but about a man whose *character* is defined by hastiness of speech.

The word **בִּדְבָרָיו** (biḏḇārāyw — "in his words/matters") uses **דָּבָר** (dāḇār), one of the most theologically significant words in the Hebrew Bible. **Dāḇār** means not merely "word" in the narrow linguistic sense, but "matter, thing, affair, case" — it encompasses the full weight of what is communicated, including its truth-content, its implications, and its consequences. When a man is "hasty in his *dᵉḇārîm*," he is not merely speaking quickly in tempo; he is pronouncing on *matters* — making claims, offering testimony, declaring truths — without having done the work of verification and reflection.

The word **כְּסִיל** (kᵉsîl — "fool") in Proverbs denotes not a morally wicked person per se, but a *dull, slow, intellectually lazy* person. As the **Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible** by **Robert Jamieson**, A.R. Fausset, and David

Brown (1871) notes on this verse, the comparison implies "self-conceit" on the part of the hasty speaker — he speaks as though he already knows, when in fact he has not taken the time to know. The *kᵉsîl*, by contrast, may be ignorant, but his ignorance is at least honest; he does not pretend to know what he does not know. Jamieson further connects this verse to Proverbs 21:5 and Proverbs 26:12, where the self-conceited man is likewise declared worse than a fool.

Matthew Henry, in his *Concise Commentary*, writes with characteristic clarity: *"When a man is self-conceited, rash, and given to wrangling, there is more hope of the ignorant and profligate."* Henry's insight is devastating: the hasty speaker is *worse* than one who is merely uninformed, because the hasty speaker actively compounds his ignorance with presumption. He does not merely lack knowledge — he *pretends* to possess it, and in so doing, he closes the door to ever actually acquiring it.

The **Pulpit Commentary** on this verse observes the connection to **James 1:19**: *"Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak."* It further cites **Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 9:18**: *"A talkative man (γλωσσώδης, glossōdes) is dangerous in his city; and he that is rash (προπετής, propetēs) in his words shall be hated."* The ancient wisdom tradition, across Hebrew, Greek, and Coptic witness, is unanimous: the person who speaks without verification is not merely unwise — he is *dangerous*.

Ellicott's Commentary adds a crucial psychological dimension: *"The fool is a dull, self-satisfied person, but may learn better; the man who is hasty and ill-advised in his words has a harder task before him in governing his tongue."* This is the heart of the matter. The fool — the *kᵉsîl* — has the possibility of change, precisely because he does not pretend to wisdom he does not possess. The hasty speaker, however, has already declared himself an authority; to retract his words would require the kind of humility that his very hastiness reveals he lacks. As the Keil and Delitzsch commentary puts it: *"The*

ass, according to the fable, comes at last farther than the greyhound" — slow and steady reflection outruns the impulsive rush of the self-appointed expert.

[Nederlands]

Het Hebreeuwse werkwoord **אָץ** (ʾāṣ), van de wortel א-ו-ץ (ʾ-w-ṣ), betekent fundamenteel "drukken, aandringen, haasten, zich haasten." Het draagt de connotatie van impulsieve urgentie, van handelen onder druk — niet de druk van externe omstandigheden, maar de innerlijke dwang om te spreken voordat men heeft nagedacht. De participiale vorm **אָץ** beschrijft een gewoontetoestand: het gaat niet om een enkele verspreking, maar om een man wiens *karakter* wordt gedefinieerd door haastigheid in het spreken.

Het woord **בִּדְבָרָיו** (biḏḇārāyw — "in zijn woorden/zaken") gebruikt **דָּבָר** (dāḇār), een van de theologisch meest significante woorden in de Hebreeuwse Bijbel. **Dāḇār** betekent niet louter "woord" in de enge taalkundige zin, maar "zaak, ding, aangelegenheid, geval" — het omvat het volledige gewicht van wat wordt gecommuniceerd, inclusief de waarheidsinhoud, de implicaties en de gevolgen.

Het woord **כְּסִיל** (kᵉsîl — "dwaas") in Spreuken duidt niet op een moreel slecht persoon op zich, maar op een *traag, lui, intellectueel inactief* persoon. Zoals de **Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible** van **Robert Jamieson**, A.R. Fausset en David Brown (1871) bij dit vers opmerkt, impliceert de vergelijking "eigendunk" van de kant van de haastige spreker.

Matthew Henry schrijft in zijn *Concise Commentary* met kenmerkende helderheid: *"Wanneer een man eigenwijs, overhaast en twistziek is, is er meer hoop voor de onwetende en losbandig levende."*

[Deutsch]

Das hebräische Verb **אָץ** (ʾāṣ), von der Wurzel א-ו-ץ (ʾ-w-ṣ), bedeutet grundlegend "drängen, antreiben, eilen, sich beeilen." Es trägt die Konnotation impulsiver Dringlichkeit, des Handelns unter Druck — nicht dem Druck äußerer Umstände, sondern dem inneren Zwang, zu sprechen, bevor man nachgedacht hat. Die Partizipialform **אָץ** beschreibt einen gewohnheitsmäßigen Zustand: Es geht hier nicht um einen einzelnen Versprecher, sondern um einen Mann, dessen *Charakter* durch Voreiligkeit im Sprechen definiert wird.

Das Wort **בִּדְבָרָיו** (biḏḇārāyw — "in seinen Worten/Angelegenheiten") verwendet **דָּבָר** (dāḇār), eines der theologisch bedeutsamsten Wörter in der Hebräischen Bibel. **Dāḇār** bedeutet nicht bloß "Wort" im engen linguistischen Sinn, sondern "Sache, Angelegenheit, Fall" — es umfasst das volle Gewicht dessen, was kommuniziert wird.

Wie der **Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible** von **Robert Jamieson** (1871) zu diesem Vers anmerkt, impliziert der Vergleich "Selbstüberschätzung" seitens des voreiligen Sprechers. **Matthew Henry** schreibt: *"Wenn ein Mann eigensinnig, voreilig und streitsüchtig ist, gibt es mehr Hoffnung für den Unwissenden und Liederlichen."*

[中文]

希伯來文動詞 **אָץ**（ʾāṣ），源自詞根 א-ו-ץ（ʾ-w-ṣ），基本意思是「催促、急迫、匆忙、趕快」。它帶有衝動性緊迫感的含義，在壓力下行動——不是來自外部環境的壓力，而是在思考之前就說話的內在衝動。分詞形式 **אָץ** 描述的是一種習慣性的狀態：這不是關於一次口誤，而是關於一個性格被言語急躁所定義的人。

בִּדְבָרָיו（biḏḇārāyw——「在他的話語/事務中」）使用了 **דָּבָר**（dāḇār），這是希伯來文聖經中神學意義最為深遠的詞彙之一。**Dāḇār** 不僅僅是狹義語言學意義上的「話語」，而是「事情、事物、事務、案件」——它涵蓋了所傳達內容的全部分量，包括其真理內容、含義和後果。當一

個人在他的 *dᵉḇārîm* 中急躁時，他不僅僅是在語速上說得快；他是在對事務發表意見——提出主張、提供證詞、宣稱真理——卻沒有做過查證和反思的工作。

כְּסִיל（kᵉsîl——「愚昧人」）在箴言中所指的不是一個道德上邪惡的人本身，而是一個遲鈍、緩慢、智識上懶惰的人。正如 **Robert Jamieson** 在其1871年的《全聖經批判與解釋註釋》中對此節經文所指出的，這個比較暗示著急躁說話者的「自負」。**Matthew Henry** 在他的《簡明註釋》中以其一貫的清晰寫道：「當一個人自負、魯莽、好爭吵時，對無知和放蕩的人還有更多指望。」

PART IV: THE TRUE MEANING — SPEAKING WITHOUT VERIFICATION IS WORSE THAN IGNORANCE

DEEL IV: DE WARE BETEKENIS — SPREKEN ZONDER VERIFICATIE IS ERGER DAN ONWETENDHEID

TEIL IV: DIE WAHRE BEDEUTUNG — SPRECHEN OHNE ÜBERPRÜFUNG IST SCHLIMMER ALS UNWISSENHEIT

第四部分：真正的含義 — 未經查證地說話比無知更糟糕

[English]

With the textual, linguistic, and commentarial foundation now established, we can articulate the true meaning of Proverbs 29:20 with precision.

The verse describes a specific kind of person: the one who *speaks quickly* — that is, without verifying his claims, without checking his information, and sometimes fabricating outright lies — for the purpose of appearing knowledgeable before others. This is the person who "just wants to fit in" with a group, who desires to be seen as informed and authoritative, and who therefore *rushes to pronounce on topics he has not studied,*

repeats claims he has not verified, and invents facts he has never confirmed. Solomon declares that such a person is worse than a fool — worse than the **כְּסִיל** (kᵉsîl), the dull and slow-witted man who at least has the honesty of his ignorance.

Why is this so severe a judgment? Because the fool's problem is *lack of knowledge*, which can be remedied by instruction. But the hasty speaker's problem is *pretension to knowledge he does not possess*, which is a far deeper spiritual disease. He does not lack information — he lacks *integrity*. And because he has already positioned himself as one who knows, he has made himself unteachable. As **Derek Prince** (葉光明) taught in his extensive teachings on the tongue (cf. "Use and Abuse of the Tongue," "Spiritual Diseases of the Tongue"), careless and unverified speech is among the most destructive forces in the life of the believer, because words, once spoken, take on a life of their own — they shape perceptions, destroy reputations, and, most dangerously, create false realities that people begin to believe.

Charles H. Spurgeon, in his sermon *"A Hasty Expression Penitently Retracted,"* warned with characteristic force: *"Hasty deeds and hasty words make up the most horrible parts of human history."* Spurgeon understood that the hasty speaker is not merely imprudent — he is a *source of destruction*. He also warned: *"Beware of letting your tongue outrun your brain."* The point is not that speaking is wrong, but that speaking *without the work of thought and verification* is a form of moral recklessness.

Jordan Peterson, though not a theologian in the traditional sense, has articulated a principle deeply consonant with this biblical wisdom in his *12 Rules for Life*, Rule 8: "Tell the truth — or, at least, don't lie." Peterson writes: *"You can't trust yourself if you lie."* The insight is profoundly biblical: the person who speaks without verifying — who repeats what he has heard without checking, who fills in the gaps of his knowledge with invention — is not merely deceiving others; he is corrupting *himself*. Each unverified claim hardens the conscience, dulls the faculty of discernment, and builds a structure of

falsehood that will eventually collapse under the weight of truth. Peterson further observes that the person who lies (or speaks carelessly) does so because he wants to manipulate reality to serve his purposes rather than submitting to reality as it is. This is precisely the spiritual danger identified in Proverbs 29:20.

Dr. Chuck Missler was famous for exhorting his audiences: *"Don't take my word for it — be like the Bereans and search the Scriptures!"* This exhortation, rooted in Acts 17:11, where the Berean Jews are commended for examining Paul's claims against the Scriptures, embodies the opposite virtue of the hasty speaker. The Berean does not rush to judgment; he verifies. The hasty speaker does not verify; he rushes. Missler's entire teaching ministry was built on the premise that *truth must be tested*, and that to repeat a claim without testing it is to participate in potential falsehood.

John Lennox, the Oxford mathematician and Christian apologist, has spoken extensively on the nature of truth, insisting that truth is not subjective preference but correspondence to reality. In his dialogue on "What is Truth?" Lennox reflects that Christianity makes a bold claim: that truth is ultimately not merely a proposition but a *Person* — Jesus Christ, who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6). If truth is a Person, then to speak falsehood — even carelessly, even without malicious intent — is to dishonor that Person. The hasty speaker who speaks without verification does not merely make a factual error; he offends against the very nature of the God who *is* Truth.

William Lane Craig has argued in his moral philosophy that objective moral duties are grounded in God's nature, and that among these duties is the obligation to truth-telling. If God is, by nature, truthful and cannot lie (Titus 1:2; Hebrews 6:18), then creatures made in His image bear a special obligation not to traffic in falsehood — whether deliberate or reckless. Craig's framework makes clear that the distinction between

"intentional lying" and "reckless speech" is one of degree, not of kind: both violate the moral law rooted in God's truthful character.

Alvin Plantinga, in his epistemological work on *warrant and proper function*, argues that a belief has warrant — and therefore qualifies as knowledge — only when it is produced by cognitive faculties *functioning properly* in an appropriate epistemic environment. The hasty speaker's "knowledge" fails this test on every count: his cognitive faculties are not functioning properly (he has not done the work of investigation), his epistemic environment is corrupted (he is motivated by social acceptance rather than truth), and therefore his claims lack warrant entirely. What he speaks is not knowledge but *opinion masquerading as knowledge* — which is worse than honest ignorance.

The person who rushes to speak on a topic he has not studied does so for one reason: he wants others to view him as knowledgeable. He wants to *fit in*. He wants the social capital that comes from being the one who "knows things." And so he speaks — quickly, confidently, authoritatively — repeating what he has heard from others without checking whether it is true, filling in the gaps with invention, embellishing details to make his account more impressive. For a time, this may succeed. The group accepts him; he gains the reputation he sought. But eventually — *inevitably* — the truth emerges. Those who actually possess knowledge, who have done the work of verification, who have studied the matter carefully, will expose his claims as false. And when this happens, the hasty speaker is not merely embarrassed; he is *destroyed* by the very facts he refused to investigate.

As **N.T. Wright** has emphasized in his work on Christian character (*After You Believe*), the formation of virtue is not automatic — it requires the deliberate cultivation of habits of truthfulness, patience, and intellectual humility. The hasty speaker has cultivated the opposite habits: recklessness, impatience, and intellectual pride. Wright's framework of

virtue ethics makes clear that the hasty speaker's problem is not merely a bad *action* but a bad *character* — one that has been shaped by the repeated choice to speak before thinking, to assert before verifying, to impress before understanding.

Bishop Robert Barron has spoken powerfully about integrity as the foundation of the moral life, teaching that *"what we do defines who we are."* The hasty speaker's repeated acts of unverified speech do not merely produce individual falsehoods — they form a *character of dishonesty* that becomes increasingly difficult to reverse. Barron's teaching that virtue is a "brick wall" built one act at a time applies equally to vice: each unverified claim is a brick in the wall of a dishonest character.

Fr. Josiah Trenham, in his Orthodox teaching ministry, has emphasized that the triumph of Orthodoxy is *the triumph of truth over lies*. In the patristic tradition that Trenham represents, careless speech is not a minor failing but a serious spiritual malady, because the Church Fathers understood that words participate in the reality they describe: to speak falsely is to distort reality itself, and thereby to oppose God, who is the author of all reality.

Dr. Michael S. Heiser, in his extensive work on biblical interpretation, consistently urged that Scripture be read *in its own context* — the context of the ancient Near Eastern world that produced it. In that world, the spoken word carried legal and covenantal weight; to speak hastily was not merely a social faux pas but a potential violation of covenant faithfulness. Heiser's hermeneutical principle applies directly to Proverbs 29:20: when Solomon warns against hasty speech, he is warning against a violation of the covenantal obligation to truth that binds every member of God's people.

Cliffe Knechtle, the well-known open-air evangelist, has spent decades engaging skeptics and seekers with careful, well-reasoned arguments. His method embodies the opposite of the hasty speaker: he listens carefully, asks clarifying questions, and

responds with measured precision. Knechtle's ministry demonstrates that truth spoken carefully is far more powerful than falsehood spoken confidently.

Ray Comfort, in his evangelistic ministry, has frequently confronted the sin of lying directly, asking strangers on the street, "Have you ever told a lie?" His point is that lying — even "small" lies — reveals a fallen moral condition. Comfort's approach is deeply relevant to Proverbs 29:20: the person who speaks without verification may not intend to lie, but the effect is the same — false information is propagated, reputations are damaged, and truth is obscured. In Comfort's framework, the sin is not mitigated by the speaker's claim that he "didn't mean to lie" — the damage is done regardless of intent.

Robby Gallaty, pastor and discipleship advocate, has taught that the discipline of "replicate" — reproducing truth faithfully — requires the prior discipline of *verification*. A disciple who passes on unverified information is not making disciples but making fools.

Nate Sala, the Christian apologist, has built his ministry around the careful examination of claims, encouraging believers to think critically and to verify before they affirm. His work embodies the Proverbs 29:20 principle: do not speak until you have done the work of knowing.

[Nederlands]

Met de tekstuele, taalkundige en commentariële basis nu vastgesteld, kunnen we de ware betekenis van Spreuken 29:20 met precisie verwoorden.

Het vers beschrijft een specifiek soort persoon: degene die *snel spreekt* — dat wil zeggen, zonder zijn beweringen te verifiëren, zonder zijn informatie te controleren, en soms regelrechte leugens fabriceert — met het doel deskundig te lijken voor anderen. Dit is de persoon die "gewoon erbij wil horen" in een groep, die gezien wil worden als geïnformeerd en gezaghebbend, en die daarom *haast maakt om zich uit te spreken over onderwerpen die hij niet heeft bestudeerd, beweringen herhaalt die hij niet heeft*

geverifieerd, en feiten verzint die hij nooit heeft bevestigd. Salomo verklaart dat zo'n persoon erger is dan een dwaas — erger dan de **כְּסִיל** (kᵉsîl), de trage en trage man die tenminste de eerlijkheid van zijn onwetendheid heeft.

Zoals **Derek Prince** onderwees in zijn uitgebreide leringen over de tong, zijn onzorgvuldige en ongeverifieerde woorden een van de meest destructieve krachten in het leven van de gelovige. **Charles H. Spurgeon** waarschuwde: *"Haastige daden en haastige woorden vormen de meest verschrikkelijke delen van de menselijke geschiedenis."* **Jordan Peterson** schreef: *"Je kunt jezelf niet vertrouwen als je liegt."* **Dr. Chuck Missler** spoorde zijn toehoorders altijd aan: *"Neem mijn woord er niet voor aan — wees als de Bereërs en onderzoek de Schriften!"*

N.T. Wright heeft benadrukt dat de vorming van deugd de bewuste cultivering van gewoonten van waarachtigheid, geduld en intellectuele nederigheid vereist. **Bishop Robert Barron** heeft krachtig gesproken over integriteit als het fundament van het morele leven. **Fr. Josiah Trenham** heeft in zijn orthodoxe onderwijsministerij benadrukt dat de triomf van de Orthodoxie de triomf van waarheid over leugens is. **Dr. Michael S. Heiser** drong er consequent op aan dat de Schrift in haar eigen context gelezen wordt. **William Lane Craig** heeft betoogd dat objectieve morele plichten geworteld zijn in Gods natuur, en dat onder deze plichten de verplichting tot waarheid behoort. **Alvin Plantinga** heeft betoogd dat een overtuiging alleen gerechtvaardigd is wanneer zij wordt geproduceerd door cognitieve vermogens die *naar behoren functioneren*.

[Deutsch]

Mit der nun etablierten textlichen, linguistischen und kommentarischen Grundlage können wir die wahre Bedeutung von Sprüche 29:20 präzise formulieren.

Der Vers beschreibt eine bestimmte Art von Person: denjenigen, der *schnell spricht* — das heißt, ohne seine Behauptungen zu überprüfen, ohne seine Informationen zu

kontrollieren und manchmal glatte Lügen fabrizierend — um vor anderen als sachkundig zu erscheinen. Dies ist die Person, die "einfach dazugehören will," die als informiert und autoritativ angesehen werden möchte und die daher *eilt, sich zu Themen zu äußern, die sie nicht studiert hat, Behauptungen wiederholt, die sie nicht überprüft hat, und Fakten erfindet, die sie nie bestätigt hat*. Salomo erklärt, dass eine solche Person schlimmer ist als ein Narr.

Wie **Derek Prince** in seinen umfangreichen Lehren über die Zunge lehrte, gehört nachlässige und ungeprüfte Rede zu den zerstörerischsten Kräften im Leben des Gläubigen. **Charles H. Spurgeon** warnte: *"Voreilige Taten und voreilige Worte machen die schrecklichsten Teile der Menschheitsgeschichte aus."* **Jordan Peterson** schrieb: *"Man kann sich selbst nicht vertrauen, wenn man lügt."* **Dr. Chuck Missler** ermahnte sein Publikum stets: *"Nehmt nicht mein Wort dafür — seid wie die Beröer und forscht in den Schriften!"*

[中文]

現在已經建立了文本、語言學和註釋學的基礎，我們可以精確地闡明箴言 29:20 的真正含義。

這節經文描述了一種特定類型的人：說話很快的人——也就是說，不驗證自己的主張、不核實自己的資訊，有時甚至編造徹頭徹尾的謊言——目的是在他人面前顯得博學。這就是那種「只是想融入」一個群體的人，渴望被視為見多識廣和有權威的人，因此急於對他沒有研究過的話題發表意見，重複他沒有驗證過的說法，編造他從未證實過的事實。所羅門宣告這樣的人比愚昧人更糟糕——比那個至少擁有其無知之誠實的遲鈍緩慢之人 **כְּסִיל**（kᵉsîl）更糟糕。

為什麼判斷如此嚴厲？因為愚昧人的問題是缺乏知識，這可以通過教導來補救。但急躁說話者的問題是假裝擁有他不具備的知識，這是一種更深層的屬靈疾病。他不是缺乏資訊——他缺乏的是正直。而且因為他已經把自己定位為一個有知識的人，他已經使自己無法

受教。正如葉光明在他關於舌頭的廣泛教導中所教導的（參見「舌頭的使用與濫用」、「舌頭的屬靈疾病」），輕率和未經查證的言語是信徒生命中最具破壞力的力量之一。

司布真（**Charles H. Spurgeon**）在他的講道*「悔改地收回的急躁表達」中以其一貫的力量警告說：「急躁的行為和急躁的話語構成了人類歷史上最可怕的部分。」* **Jordan Peterson** 寫道：「如果你撒謊，你就無法信任自己。」**乃克乃博士（Dr. Chuck Missler）**以勸勉聽眾而聞名：「不要只聽我的話——要像庇哩亞人一樣查考聖經！」

N.T. Wright 強調，美德的養成不是自動的——它需要刻意培養真實、耐心和智識謙卑的習慣。**Robert Barron** 主教有力地談到了正直作為道德生活的基礎。乔赛亚·特伦汉姆神父（**Fr. Josiah Trenham**）在他的東正教教導事工中強調，正教的勝利是真理對謊言的勝利。海瑟博士（**Dr. Michael S. Heiser**）一貫敦促《聖經》應在其自身的背景中閱讀。**William Lane Craig** 論證說客觀的道德義務根植於神的本性，而在這些義務中包括說真話的義務。**Alvin Plantinga** 論證說，一個信念只有在由正常運作的認知能力產生時才是有保證的。

PART V: SPEAKING WITHOUT VERIFICATION IS LYING — AND LYING IS SIN

DEEL V: SPREKEN ZONDER VERIFICATIE IS LIEGEN — EN LIEGEN IS ZONDE

TEIL V: SPRECHEN OHNE ÜBERPRÜFUNG IST LÜGEN — UND LÜGEN IST SÜNDE

第五部分：未經查證地說話就是撒謊 — 而撒謊是罪

[English]

Scripture is unambiguous: **"Lying lips are an abomination to the LORD, but those who deal truly are His delight"** (Proverbs 12:22). The Ninth Commandment declares: **"You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor"** (Exodus 20:16). The Hebrew phrase **לֹא־תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר** (lō taʿaneh bᵉrēʿăḵā ʿēḏ šāqer) literally means "you shall not answer concerning your neighbor as a lying witness." The commandment prohibits not merely intentional perjury in a courtroom, but the entire range of false testimony — including the repetition of unverified claims that damage another's reputation or distort the truth.

The question must be asked directly: is speaking without verifying one's claims *the same as* telling lies? The answer, both theologically and morally, is yes — and here is why.

When a person speaks a claim as though it were fact without having verified it, he is implicitly *testifying* to its truth. He is bearing witness. If his claim turns out to be false, he has borne *false witness* — not because he intended to deceive (though often the intent is present), but because he *recklessly disregarded* the truth. In legal traditions, this is known as *reckless disregard for the truth*, and it is treated as morally equivalent to deliberate falsehood. The reason is simple: the damage to the person or cause about which one speaks falsely is the same whether the falsehood was deliberate or reckless. The destroyed reputation, the poisoned relationship, the distorted reality — these do not depend on the speaker's subjective intent but on the objective falsehood of his words.

Dr. Craig Keener, the prolific New Testament scholar, has written extensively on the cultural and legal context of truthfulness in the ancient world, demonstrating that both Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures held speakers to a strict standard of veracity. In the ancient Near East, to speak a thing was to give it a kind of reality; careless speech was therefore not merely foolish but *ontologically dangerous*. Keener's work helps us understand why the biblical tradition treats hasty and unverified speech with such

severity: it is not simply a matter of personal reputation, but of the very fabric of communal truth.

Dr. Karlo Broussard, the Catholic apologist, has argued that the moral theology of lying encompasses not only intentional deception but also *culpable negligence* in truth-telling. If a person has the ability and the obligation to verify a claim before speaking it, and he fails to do so, he is morally responsible for the falsehood that results — even if he did not intend to deceive. This is analogous to the legal concept of *negligence*: the driver who kills a pedestrian because he was texting while driving did not *intend* to kill, but his recklessness makes him morally (and legally) culpable. So it is with the hasty speaker: his failure to verify makes him a participant in falsehood.

Dave Armstrong, the Catholic apologist and writer, has emphasized in his extensive writings on truth and integrity that the Catholic moral tradition distinguishes between *formal lying* (the deliberate intention to deceive) and *material lying* (stating something false without intending to deceive). Both, however, can be sinful, because the obligation to truth is not merely about subjective intent but about *objective conformity to reality*. The hasty speaker who states a falsehood he could have verified commits a *material lie*, and while the gravity of his sin may differ from that of the deliberate liar, it is sin nonetheless.

Fr. Chad Ripperger, the traditional Catholic priest and exorcist, has taught extensively on the vice of *detraction* — the sin of revealing another's faults or failings without just cause. When the hasty speaker repeats unverified claims about another person, he often engages in detraction, damaging reputations on the basis of rumor and hearsay rather than verified fact. Ripperger's moral theology makes clear that detraction is a grave sin against justice and charity, and that it is not mitigated by the speaker's claim that he was merely "repeating what he heard."

This brings us to the most damning element of the hasty speaker's sin: **the excuse of "so-and-so told me that."** When the hasty speaker's falsehoods are exposed — when the facts come to light and his claims are shown to be false — he inevitably retreats to this excuse: "I didn't make it up; someone else told me that." But far from mitigating his sin, this excuse *compounds* it in the eyes of God, for several reasons.

First, it is an act of **cowardice**. The speaker, having claimed the authority of knowledge, now refuses to accept the responsibility that comes with it. He shifts the blame to another, which is itself a form of bearing false witness — for he is now implicitly accusing "so-and-so" of being the source of the falsehood, when in fact the sin was his own: the sin of speaking without verification.

Second, it reveals **unrepentance**. A truly repentant person would say, "I was wrong. I should not have spoken without checking. I am sorry." But the person who says, "Well, so-and-so told me that" is not repenting — he is *defending himself*. He is saying, in effect, "It's not my fault." And Scripture is clear that the refusal to take responsibility for one's sin is itself a deepening of that sin. As **1 John 1:8** declares: *"If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."*

Third, it **multiplies the damage**. By naming the person who allegedly told him the falsehood, the hasty speaker now drags another person into his web of deception. He creates a chain of unverified claims that can spread like wildfire, destroying relationships and reputations at every link.

Fr. Cajetan Cuddy, O.P., in the Dominican intellectual tradition, would recognize this dynamic as a violation of the Thomistic virtue of *prudence* (prudentia) — specifically, the sub-virtue of *circumspection* (circumspectio), which requires that one consider all the relevant circumstances before acting or speaking. The hasty speaker lacks circumspection entirely; he has spoken without considering the circumstances, and

when confronted, he compounds his imprudence with an excuse that involves yet more unverified claims.

Bishop Manuel Acuña has taught on the responsibility of Christians to be people of truth in an age of deception, emphasizing that the moral character of the believer is revealed not only in what he does but in what he says — and in what he *refuses* to say until he has verified it.

Fr. Paul Truebenbach has spoken on the spiritual danger of gossip and unverified speech in the life of the parish, warning that careless words can destroy the Body of Christ from within more effectively than any external persecution.

Fr. Evdokym and **Fr. Moses McPherson**, in the Orthodox tradition, have both taught that the discipline of the tongue is central to the ascetic life — that the monk who cannot govern his speech cannot govern his soul, and that the same principle applies, mutatis mutandis, to every Christian.

Josh McPherson, a Reformed pastor and preacher, has emphasized the importance of speaking truth in community, teaching that the health of the church depends on its members' commitment to honesty and verification rather than gossip and assumption.

Pastor Stephen Tong (唐崇榮牧師), the renowned Chinese-Indonesian Reformed evangelist, has repeatedly called the church back to the foundations of truth, insisting that pastors and Christians alike must speak on the basis of verified truth and not on the basis of rumor, popular opinion, or the desire to please a crowd. Tong's prophetic voice in Asia resonates powerfully with the message of Proverbs 29:20: the man who speaks hastily to gain approval is building his house on sand.

Charlie Kirk, the American commentator and speaker, has frequently argued in public discourse that facts must be verified before they are repeated — a principle that, while

often articulated in political contexts, is fundamentally a biblical principle rooted in the Ninth Commandment.

Dr. Leighton Flowers has taught on the responsibility of Christians to engage honestly with opposing viewpoints, to represent others' positions accurately, and to verify claims before repeating them — a discipline that is essential to maintaining integrity in theological dialogue.

Daniel Maritz (DLM Christian Lifestyle) has emphasized in his online teaching ministry that the Christian life requires not only faith but *intellectual honesty* — the willingness to check facts, to admit error, and to speak only what one knows to be true.

David Diga Hernandez, the evangelist, has taught on the power of the spoken word in the life of the believer, emphasizing that words spoken carelessly can open doors to spiritual bondage and that the discipline of truthful speech is essential to spiritual freedom.

Vlad Savchuk has preached extensively on the power of words, teaching that the tongue is a spiritual weapon that can be used for life or for death (Proverbs 18:21), and that the person who wields it carelessly is wielding a weapon against himself.

Matt Mason (Lion of Fire Ministries) has similarly taught on the spiritual dangers of careless speech, emphasizing that unverified words carry spiritual consequences beyond the merely social.

Dr. John Bergsma, the Catholic biblical scholar, has noted that the wisdom literature of the Old Testament consistently treats speech as a *moral act* — not merely a conveyance of information, but an exercise of moral agency for which the speaker is fully accountable before God.

Arlen Khachatourians has taught on the importance of truth-telling in the Armenian Christian tradition, drawing on the ancient witness of the Armenian Church to the centrality of integrity in the life of faith.

Dr. Dojcin Zivadinovic has contributed to the discussion of biblical ethics and the obligation of truthfulness from a Seventh-day Adventist scholarly perspective, emphasizing that the Decalogue's prohibition against false witness extends to all forms of reckless and unverified speech.

Rikhard Hartikainen has emphasized, in his teaching and apologetic work, the critical importance of intellectual honesty and verification in Christian witness.

Fr. Carlos Martins, the Catholic priest and evangelist known for his relic pilgrimages, has spoken on the importance of integrity in faith, teaching that the Christian's witness is destroyed when his words cannot be trusted.

Fr. Daniel Seo has taught on the spiritual discipline of silence and measured speech, drawing on both Eastern and Western Christian traditions to emphasize that the tongue must be governed by wisdom.

Jessica Murray (Craft to Christ) has emphasized in her ministry the importance of truth in every area of life, teaching that the transition from worldliness to Christ-centered living requires, among other things, a radical commitment to honesty in speech.

Fr. Leo Patalinghug (The Father Leo Show) has spoken with characteristic warmth and clarity about the need for Christians to be people of integrity, whose words match reality and whose speech is seasoned with truth.

Dr. Thomas Madden, the historian, has noted that throughout Christian history, the credibility of the Church's witness has been directly proportional to the truthfulness of its members' speech.

Msgr. Stephen Rossetti has written on the spiritual dimensions of truth-telling in the priestly life, emphasizing that the minister of God who speaks carelessly undermines the very Gospel he proclaims.

Fr. Vincent Lampert, the exorcist of the Archdiocese of Indianapolis, has warned that the devil is described in Scripture as "the father of lies" (John 8:44), and that every act of lying or careless falsehood participates, to some degree, in the work of the enemy.

Mark Batush has taught on the importance of verifying claims in apologetics, emphasizing that the credibility of the Christian message depends on the intellectual honesty of those who proclaim it.

Jeffery Poor has contributed to discussions on Christian integrity, emphasizing that the believer's commitment to truth must extend to every word he speaks, not merely to formal declarations of faith.

Kenny Burchard, the apologist and educator, has emphasized that apologetics is not about winning arguments but about *truthful engagement* — and that this requires the discipline of verification before assertion.

Dr. Douglas Hamp has taught on the importance of careful hermeneutics and verified claims in biblical interpretation, warning that hasty and unsupported interpretations of Scripture can do as much damage as outright falsehoods.

Bro Dr Prem has emphasized in his teaching the importance of intellectual humility and verified speech, particularly in cross-cultural Christian dialogue where the risk of misrepresentation is high.

Fr. Chris Alar, the popular Marian priest, has spoken on the importance of truth in devotional life, teaching that false claims — even well-intentioned ones — can undermine the faith of the faithful.

Fr. Donald Calloway has emphasized in his conversion story and ministry that the path to God is the path of truth, and that every departure from truthfulness, however small, is a departure from that path.

Fr. Dan Reehil has spoken on the pastoral dangers of gossip and unverified speech in parish life, warning that these sins can destroy the communion of the faithful more quickly than any external threat.

G.C. Lewis Sr. has written on the importance of verified speech in the Christian life, emphasizing that the believer who speaks without checking his facts brings dishonor not only upon himself but upon the Name he claims to represent.

[Nederlands]

De Schrift is ondubbelzinnig: **"Leugenlippen zijn de HEERE een gruwel, maar wie trouw handelen, zijn Hem welgevallig"** (Spreuken 12:22). Het Negende Gebod verklaart: **"Gij zult geen vals getuigenis spreken tegen uw naaste"** (Exodus 20:16).

Wanneer een persoon een bewering als feit uitspreekt zonder deze te hebben geverifieerd, *getuigt* hij impliciet van de waarheid ervan. Als zijn bewering vals blijkt te zijn, heeft hij *vals getuigenis* afgelegd — niet omdat hij bedoelde te bedriegen, maar omdat hij *roekeloos de waarheid negeerde*.

Het meest veroordelende element van de zonde van de haastige spreker is **het excuus "die-en-die vertelde me dat."** Wanneer de leugens worden ontmaskerd, trekt hij zich onvermijdelijk terug achter dit excuus. Maar verre van zijn zonde te verlichten, *verergert* dit excuus deze in de ogen van God. Het is een daad van **lafheid** — hij verschuift de schuld. Het onthult **onbekeerlijkheid** — hij verdedigt zichzelf in plaats van berouw te tonen. En het **vermenigvuldigt de schade** — door de vermeende bron te noemen, sleept hij nog een persoon mee in zijn web van bedrog.

Zoals **Derek Prince** onderwees, zijn **Pastor Stephen Tong**, **Charlie Kirk**, **Dr. Leighton Flowers**, **Daniel Maritz**, en vele anderen het erover eens: de christen die spreekt zonder te verifiëren, brengt oneer niet alleen over zichzelf maar over de Naam die hij beweert te vertegenwoordigen.

[Deutsch]

Die Schrift ist eindeutig: **"Lügnerische Lippen sind dem HERRN ein Gräuel, aber die treu handeln, gefallen ihm"** (Sprüche 12:22). Das Neunte Gebot erklärt: **"Du sollst kein falsches Zeugnis reden wider deinen Nächsten"** (Exodus 20:16).

Wenn eine Person eine Behauptung als Tatsache ausspricht, ohne sie überprüft zu haben, *bezeugt* sie implizit deren Wahrheit. Wenn sich seine Behauptung als falsch herausstellt, hat er *falsches Zeugnis* abgelegt — nicht weil er beabsichtigte zu täuschen, sondern weil er *rücksichtslos die Wahrheit missachtete*.

Das verurteilendste Element der Sünde des voreiligen Sprechers ist **die Ausrede "der und der hat mir das gesagt."** Wenn die Falschaussagen aufgedeckt werden, zieht er sich unweigerlich auf diese Ausrede zurück. Doch weit davon entfernt, seine Sünde zu mildern, *verschlimmert* diese Ausrede sie in den Augen Gottes. Es ist ein Akt der **Feigheit**, es offenbart **Unbußfertigkeit**, und es **vervielfacht den Schaden**.

[繁體中文（台灣）]

《聖經》是明確無誤的：「說謊言的嘴為耶和華所憎惡；行事誠實的為他所喜悅」（箴言 12:22）。第九條誡命宣告：「不可作假見證陷害人」（出埃及記 20:16）。希伯來文短語 **לֹא־תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר**（lō taʿaneh bᵊrēʿăḵā ʿēḏ šāqer）字面意思是「你不可作為虛假的見證人回答關於你鄰舍的事。」這條誡命所禁止的不僅是法庭上的故意偽證，而是整個範圍的虛假見證——包括重複未經查證的、損害他人名譽或歪曲真相的說法。

必須直接提出這個問題：未經查證就說出自己的主張是否等同於說謊？答案，無論從神學還是道德角度來看，都是肯定的——原因如下。

當一個人在沒有驗證的情況下將一個說法當作事實來陳述時，他是在隱含地為其真實性作見證。他是在做見證。如果他的說法被證明是虛假的，他就是作了假見證——不是因為他有意欺騙（雖然意圖常常是存在的），而是因為他罔顧真相。

正如克雷格·基納博士（**Dr. Craig Keener**）在他對古代世界中真實性的文化和法律背景的廣泛研究中所展示的，猶太和希臘羅馬文化都對說話者持有嚴格的真實性標準。布魯薩爾博士（**Dr. Karlo Broussard**）論證說，關於撒謊的道德神學不僅包括故意欺騙，還包括在說真話方面的應受責備的疏忽。**Dave Armstrong** 強調，天主教的道德傳統區分了形式上的撒謊（故意欺騙的意圖）和質料上的撒謊（在沒有欺騙意圖的情況下陳述虛假的事情）。里珀格神父（**Fr. Chad Ripperger**）廣泛地教導了毀損名譽的惡習——在沒有正當理由的情況下揭露他人過失的罪。

這將我們帶到急躁說話者之罪中最致命的因素：「某某告訴我的」這個藉口。當急躁說話者的虛假被揭穿時——當事實真相大白、他的說法被證明為假時——他不可避免地退回到這個藉口：「我沒有編造；是別人告訴我的。」但這個藉口非但沒有減輕他的罪，反而在神的眼中使之加重，原因有幾個。

首先，它是一種怯懦的行為。說話者曾聲稱擁有知識的權威，現在卻拒絕承擔隨之而來的責任。他將責任推卸給另一個人，這本身就是一種作假見證的形式。

其次，它顯示了不悔改。一個真正悔改的人會說：「我錯了。我不應該在沒有核實的情況下說話。我很抱歉。」但是說「嗯，是某某告訴我的」的人並不是在悔改——他是在為自己辯護。

第三，它增加了損害。通過點名那個據稱告訴他虛假信息的人，急躁的說話者現在將另一個人拖入了他的欺騙之網。

正如柯迪神父（**Fr. Cajetan Cuddy**）在道明會知識傳統中所認知的，這種行為是對多瑪斯式明智（prudentia）之德行的違反。阿庫尼亞主教（**Bishop Manuel Acuña**）教導了基督徒

在欺騙時代做真理之人的責任。特魯本巴赫神父（**Fr. Paul Truebenbach**）談到了在堂區生活中八卦和未經查證的言語的屬靈危險。埃夫多基姆神父（**Fr. Evdokym**）和摩西·麥克弗森神父（**Fr. Moses McPherson**）在東正教傳統中都教導了管教舌頭是苦修生活的核心。Josh McPherson 強調了在社區中說真話的重要性。唐崇榮牧師反覆呼籲教會回歸真理的根基。查理·柯克在公共論述中頻繁地論證事實必須在重複之前被查證。福勞爾斯博士（**Dr. Leighton Flowers**）教導了基督徒誠實地對待對立觀點的責任。Daniel Maritz（DLM Christian Lifestyle）強調了基督徒生活不僅需要信仰，還需要智識上的誠實。David Diga Hernandez 教導了信徒生命中口說之言的力量。Vlad Savchuk 廣泛地傳講了話語的力量。Matt Mason（Lion of Fire Ministries）同樣教導了輕率言語的屬靈危險。伯格斯馬博士（**Dr. John Bergsma**）指出舊約的智慧文學一貫將言語視為一種道德行為。Arlen Khachatourians 教導了亞美尼亞基督教傳統中說真話的重要性。日瓦迪諾維奇博士（**Dr. Dojcin Zivadinovic**）從基督復臨安息日會的學術角度強調了十誡中對假見證的禁令延伸到所有形式的魯莽和未經查證的言語。Rikhard Hartikainen 強調了智識誠實和查證在基督教見證中的關鍵重要性。馬丁斯神父（**Fr. Carlos Martins**）談到了信仰中正直的重要性。徐神父（**Fr. Daniel Seo**）教導了靜默和有分寸言語的屬靈紀律。Jessica Murray（Craft to Christ）在她的事工中強調了生活各領域中真理的重要性。巴達林古格神父（**Fr. Leo Patalinghug**，The Father Leo Show 神父里奧秀）以其一貫的溫暖和清晰談到了基督徒需要做正直之人。馬登博士（**Dr. Thomas Madden**）指出，縱觀基督教歷史，教會見證的可信度與其成員言語的真實性成正比。羅塞蒂閣下（**Msgr. Stephen Rossetti**）撰寫了關於司鐸生活中說真話的屬靈維度。蘭伯特神父（**Fr. Vincent Lampert**）警告說，魔鬼在《聖經》中被描述為「謊言之父」（約翰福音 8:44），每一個撒謊或輕率虛假的行為都在某種程度上參與了仇敵的工作。Mark Batush 教導了在護教學中查證主張的重要性。Jeffery Poor 強調了信徒對真理的承諾必須延伸到他所說的每一句話。Kenny Burchard 強調護教學不是關於贏得辯論，而是關於真實的參與。漢普博士（**Dr. Douglas Hamp**）教導了仔細的釋經學和在聖經解釋中經過查證的主張的重要性。白林博士（**Bro Dr Prem**）在他的教學中強調了智識謙卑和經過查證的言語的重要性。阿拉爾神父（**Fr. Chris Alar**）談到了靈修生活中真理的重要性。卡洛維神父（**Fr. Donald Calloway**）在他的皈依故事和事工中強調了通往神的道路就

是真理的道路。雷希爾神父（**Fr. Dan Reehil**）談到了堂區生活中八卦和未經查證言語的牧靈危險。G.C. Lewis Sr. 撰寫了關於基督徒生活中經過查證的言語的重要性。

PART VI: CONCLUSION

DEEL VI: CONCLUSIE

TEIL VI: SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG

第六部分：結論

[English]

Proverbs 29:20 stands as one of the sharpest warnings in all of Scripture. It does not warn against righteous anger — Christ Himself and the apostles demonstrated that righteous anger is not merely permissible but, at times, obligatory. Rather, it warns against the far more common and far more insidious sin of *speaking without verification* — of rushing to pronounce on matters one has not studied, of repeating claims one has not checked, of inventing facts one has never confirmed, all for the sake of being seen as knowledgeable, of fitting in, of gaining social approval.

Such a person, Solomon declares, is worse than a fool. The fool at least has the honesty of his ignorance. The hasty speaker has dressed up his ignorance in the clothing of knowledge and has therefore made himself unteachable, unreformable, and — ultimately — a bearer of false witness.

And when his falsehoods are exposed, his retreat to the excuse of "so-and-so told me that" does not diminish his guilt but deepens it, for it reveals cowardice, unrepentance, and a willingness to drag others into the consequences of his recklessness.

The Christian is called to be a person of truth — not merely a person who avoids deliberate lies, but a person who *verifies before he speaks*, who *checks before he claims*, who *admits when he does not know*. This is the path of wisdom. This is the path of integrity. This is the path of the One who said, "I am the Truth" (John 14:6).

As **St. Gregory the Great** wrote, cited in the Pulpit Commentary on this very verse: *"He that fears to be condemned in respect of his words ought first to put to the test that which he delivers — that there may be a kind of impartial and sober umpire sitting between the heart and tongue, weighing with exactness whether the heart presents right words, which the tongue taking up with advantage may bring forward for the hearer's judgment."*

Let those who have ears to hear, hear.

[Nederlands]

Spreuken 29:20 staat als een van de scherpste waarschuwingen in de gehele Schrift. Het waarschuwt niet tegen rechtvaardige woede — Christus Zelf en de apostelen toonden aan dat rechtvaardige woede niet alleen toelaatbaar maar soms verplicht is. Het waarschuwt eerder tegen de veel voorkomende en veel verraderlijker zonde van *spreken zonder verificatie*.

Zo'n persoon, verklaart Salomo, is erger dan een dwaas. De dwaas heeft tenminste de eerlijkheid van zijn onwetendheid. De haastige spreker heeft zijn onwetendheid vermomd in het kleed van kennis en heeft zichzelf daarmee onleerbaar, onhervormbaar en — uiteindelijk — een drager van vals getuigenis gemaakt.

De christen is geroepen om een mens van waarheid te zijn — niet alleen iemand die opzettelijke leugens vermijdt, maar iemand die *verifieert voordat hij spreekt*, die *controleert voordat hij beweert*, die *toegeeft wanneer hij niet weet*.

Laten wie oren heeft om te horen, horen.

[Deutsch]

Sprüche 29:20 steht als eine der schärfsten Warnungen in der gesamten Schrift. Er warnt nicht vor gerechtem Zorn — Christus selbst und die Apostel zeigten, dass gerechter Zorn nicht nur erlaubt, sondern manchmal verpflichtend ist. Vielmehr warnt er vor der viel häufigeren und viel heimtückischeren Sünde des *Sprechens ohne Überprüfung*.

Eine solche Person, erklärt Salomo, ist schlimmer als ein Narr. Der Narr hat wenigstens die Ehrlichkeit seiner Unwissenheit. Der voreilige Sprecher hat seine Unwissenheit in das Gewand des Wissens gekleidet und sich damit unbelehrbar, unreformierbar und — letztlich — zu einem Träger falschen Zeugnisses gemacht.

Der Christ ist berufen, ein Mensch der Wahrheit zu sein — nicht nur jemand, der bewusste Lügen vermeidet, sondern jemand, der *überprüft, bevor er spricht*, der *kontrolliert, bevor er behauptet*, der *zugibt, wenn er nicht weiß*.

Wer Ohren hat zu hören, der höre.

[中文]

箴言 29:20 是整本聖經中最尖銳的警告之一。它不是警告人不要有義怒——基督本人和使徒們已經表明，義怒不僅是被允許的，有時更是義務所在。它所警告的是更為常見、更為陰險的罪——未經查證的言語——急於對自己未曾研究的事務發表意見，重複自己未曾核實的說法，編造自己從未確認的事實，這一切都是為了被視為有學識、為了融入群體、為了獲得社會認可。

這樣的人，所羅門宣告，比愚昧人更糟。愚昧人至少擁有其無知的誠實。急躁的說話者將他的無知裝扮成知識的衣裳，因此使自己不可教導、不可改正，並且——最終——成為假見證人。

而當他的謊言被揭穿時，他退回到「某某告訴我的」這個藉口，不僅不會減輕他的罪疚，反而加深了它，因為這暴露了怯懦、不悔改，以及將他人拖入他魯莽後果的意願。

基督徒被呼召成為真理之人——不僅僅是一個避免故意撒謊的人，而是一個說話之前先查證、聲稱之前先核實、不知道時坦然承認的人。這是智慧之路。這是正直之路。這是那位說「我就是真理」（約翰福音 14:6）之主的道路。

正如聖大格列高利所寫，在《講壇註釋》引用於此節經文中：「那害怕因自己的話語被定罪的人，應該首先檢驗他所要說的——使心和舌之間有一個公正而清醒的仲裁者，精確地衡量心是否呈上正確的話語，使舌頭能有把握地將其帶到聽者的審判面前。」

有耳可聽的，就應當聽。

Soli Deo Gloria. Alleen aan God de eer. Allein Gott die Ehre. 唯獨榮耀歸於神。